



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, DC 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/619,203	03/21/96	KEENE	D CRUS-0045

┌
GREG T. SUEOKA
FENWICK & WEST, LLP
TWO PALO ALTO SQUARE
PALO ALTO CA 94306

LM51/1207

┐

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, F

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2774

DATE MAILED: 12/07/98

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

08/619,203

Applicant(s)

DAVID KEENE

Examiner

FRANCES NGUYEN

Group Art Unit

2774

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

Period for Response

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 months & 1 day MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a response be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for response specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a response within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for response is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to respond within the set or extended period for response will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

- ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 9/17/98
- ☒ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

- ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
 - ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.
 - ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 1.7.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Other _____

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 2774

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The specification amendment and claim amendment as filed on 9/17/98 have been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1 through 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hancock (U.S. Patent 5,604,514) in view of Munson et al.(U.S. Patent 5,699,277), further in view of Coelho et al.(U.S. Patent 5,666,137), and further in view of Selwan et al.(U.S. Patent 5,526,025).

4. In reference to **claims 1 through 22**, Hancock discloses a display controller and associated method (video display controller (32)) for receiving video data from a data bus (22) in a component YUV(YUV16) format and storing the video data(image pel) to a display memory(30) in pixel video format(YUV8/YUV16)(see figures 1, 2A, column 3, lines 15-17, lines 26-34, column 4, lines 23-27). However, it fails to expressly teach a bus interface means coupled to the data bus. Munson et al discloses a bus interface means (PCI I/F (109) coupling to PCI bus (115)), PCI configuration

Art Unit: 2774

registers, video capture registers for data processing, Register Programming Sequencer with address pointers, address working registers (see figures 4, 16, column 2, line 47-67, column 6, lines 18-24, lines 50-56, column 26, lines 36-55, column 27, lines 51-62). However, it fails to expressly teach a receiving method of video data in contiguous successive streams of luminance and chrominance difference data. Coelho et al. teaches a receiving method of video data in contiguous successive streams of luminance and chrominance difference data: an improved technique for formatting YUV9 subsampled data as known in the art (byte lane arrangement), wherein a frame buffer is divided into plural blocks for storing sequential packed video stream data (Y, U, V); a frame can be divided into 4x4 blocks (e.g. the screen comprising 30 bands 40 blocks wide is organized with 8 bits for U and 8 bits for V to provide color information for all 16 pixels in a block, yielding an average of one bit per pixel, thus YUV9) and the original full data Y, U, V values comprises $(Y_{11} \dots Y_{120 \ 160})$, $(U_{11} \dots U_{120 \ 160})$ and $(V_{11} \dots V_{120 \ 160})$ respectively, **wherein U and V data are not all sent**. Therefore, it is possible to start processing the received digital color information for reconstruction and display (see figures 2, 3, 4, column 1, lines 28-52, column 2, lines 42-67, column 4, lines 10-23). However, those references fail to teach a bit block transfer engine for performing a replicating function. Reference Selwan et al. discloses an apparatus/method for performing run length tagging by the use of BITBLT circuit (1106), BITBLT tag generation circuit block (1202), FIFO controller (1220) sending a signal on bus (1228) to alert display memory controller (1210) to stop loading data at FIFO full condition.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the aforementioned means and method of the apparatus of Hancock, apply

Art Unit: 2774

the teaching principle of PCI interface means, utilize the Register Programming sequencer including address pointers and registers for memory control, PCI configuration registers available for programming(e.g. memory aperture predetermination) and also writing means to display buffers, the principle of decimation, byte alignment(offset) as taught by Munson et al., implement that offset teaching principle to memory address(bit level or byte level), then further apply the method of data conversion of YUV9 data into sequential packed data streams(in byte lanes) as taught by Coelho et al. , add a bit block transfer engine for data replication featuring an output signal(coupling to the aforementioned PCI interface) alerting system CPU after FIFO is full or the end of contiguous memory block is reached, as taught by Selwan et al. to obtain the combined device and associated method of Hancock-Munson et al.-Coelho et al.-Selwan et al. because it would result in reduction of significant reception time, reduction of buffer storage requirement as taught by Coelho et al.(see column 1, lines 65-67, column 2, lines 6-9), reduction of host processor utilization as taught by Munson et al.(see column 4, lines 5-6), reduction of memory access(during critical refresh process) and power consumption, and a more responsive machine, as taught by Selwan et al.(see column 3, lines 14-16, and column 24, lines 22-27).

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed on 9/17/98 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Art Unit: 2774

A. As to Applicant's argument on decoding MPEG data (Amendment page 9) , the examiner disagrees because it is based on specification whereas examination is based on claim merit; therefore, the ground of rejection is maintained.

B. As to Applicant's argument concerning Hancock '514 and Munson '277 not disclosing a display memory controller for storing video data by directing separate luminance and chrominance difference(page 11), the examiner disagrees because Hancock '514 teaches a video memory access controller 28 (shown in figure 1), display memory 30, which inherently stores YUV data in a contiguous manner. Furthermore, Coelho et al. '137 is cited for teaching of storing video data (see figures 2, 3, 4, column 1, lines 28-52, column 2, lines 42-67, column 4, lines 10-23). Note "... Cannot show non-obviousness by attacking references individually where, as here the rejections are based on combination of references. *In re Keller*, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

C. Applicant's argument concerning absence of suggestion for combining references (page 13) is not valid because " It is not necessary that the references actually suggest, expressly or in so many words, the changes or improvements that applicant has made. The test for combining references is what the references as a whole would have suggested to one of ordinary skill in the art ". *In re Sheckler*, 168 USPQ716 (CCPA 1971). *In re McLaughlin* 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971). *In re Young* 159 USPQ 725 (CCPA 1968). Therefore, the ground of rejection is maintained.

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 2774

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Francis Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 308-8858. The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays from 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Hjerpe, can be reached on (703) 305-4709. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 308-9051.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

FN

Francis Nguyen

December 3rd, 1998



**RICHARD A. HJERPE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
GROUP 2700**